

#### REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application in view of the above amendment are respectfully requested. By this amendment, claim 5 and 10 have been modified to obviate the objections under 35 U.S.C. 112; claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 7, which is indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Claims 6 and 7 have been cancelled. No new matter is involved.

The §112 statement that the term "length" in claim 9, line 1 lacks sufficient antecedent basis is not understood. Claim 9 was cancelled in the last Office Action response, and is therefore no longer in the application.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as containing subject matter which lacks support in the specification. Applicant submits that the view of FIG. 3 and the description thereof at page 8, beginning at line 15, are sufficiently clear, when taken together, to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to which it pertains to make and/or use the invention.

FIG. 3 is said to be a facial section view. Considering that this is a translation from the French, the undersigned attorney believes that FIG. 3 is a cross-sectional view, although not cross-hatched, showing the seat 20 as viewed from the front. This seat 20 is constructed with a track 56 which contains a sliding rail 54 joined as part of the intermediate piece 22. This configuration accommodates forward and backward sliding movement of the seat 20 relative to the intermediate piece 22. The horizontal

axle 24 is installed in the intermediate piece 22. See FIGs. 1, 2 and 5 and the description in the specification at page 7, lines 14-16. Since the horizontal axle is fixed in the connecting piece 22, the configuration of FIG. 3 (the subject of claim 5) is permitted to be moved backward and forward and thereby allow the position of the horizontal axle with respect to the seat to be altered. This is the language of claim 5, and applicant submits that it is adequately supported in the portions of the application just referred to.


The undersigned attorney is not a person of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains. Despite that, the understanding of the description of FIG. 3 of the drawing, as explained above, was not difficult to arrive at. Applicant submits that a person of ordinary skill in the art would be able to find support for the language of claim 5 in the application with greater ease than was experienced by the attorney. With the explanation given, it should be clear to the Examiner.

The 35 U.S.C. §102 rejections of claims 1-5, 8, 10 and 11 on the various cited prior art are believed to have been obviated by the amendment of claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of allowable claim 7. In effect, claim 1 is now claim 7 and, since the remaining claims 2-5, 8, 10 and 11 relate back to claim 1, they are also allowable by virtue of their dependence from an allowable claim.

A Request for Extension of Time for two months accompanies this Amendment, together with our Check No. 9571 for \$205.00 in payment of the fee.

In view of the above-Amendment and these remarks, this application is now submitted to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Henry M. Bissell  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 19,200

HMB/sk

6820 La Tijera Boulevard, Suite 106  
Los Angeles, California 90045  
(310) 645-1088




CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date: August 25, 2003

Signed:

  
Henry M. Bissell

RECEIVED  
SEP 03 2003  
GROUP 3600